arXiv:0806.1148v1 [cs.DM] 6 Jun 2008

An Improved Bound on the Number of Conflicts in Unsatisfiable k-CNF Formulas

Dominik Scheder and Philipp Zumstein [*]

Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zürich
8092 Zürich, Switzerland
dscheder@inf.ethz.ch, zuphilip@inf.ethz.ch

June 6, 2008

Abstract. In a CNF formula, we say that a pair C, D of clauses constitutes a *conflict* if there is a variable that occurs positively in one clause and negatively in the other. We show that any a k-CNF formula with less than $O\left(2.69^k\right)$ conflicts is satisfiable.

1 Introduction

Our goal is to find sufficient criteria for satisfiability of Boolean formulas. To be meaningful, these criteria must be easy to check, should contain certain "high-level" information about the formula, such as size and number of its clauses, but abstract from the small details of the formula, like which literals exactly some clause contains. For example, any k-CNF formula with less than 2^k clauses is satisfiable. This criterion is nice because it forgets almost all information about the formula.

In this paper, we give another sufficient criterion for satisfiability, in terms of the number of *conflicts* of a formula. Formally, a conflict of F is a pair $\{C, D\}$ of clauses in F such that there exists a variable x with $x \in C$ and $\bar{x} \in D$ (or vice versa). The set of clauses $D \in F$ that conflict with C is denoted by $\Gamma_F(C)$, and $c(F)$ denotes the total number of conflicts in F. It is clear that a formula without conflicts is satisfiable, as every variable occurs either only positively or only negatively. Further, intuitively a k-CNF formula with "few" conflicts is satisfiable, too. Giving bounds on what "few" exactly means is the goal of this paper. Formally, let $c_k := \max\{c \mid \text{every } k\text{-CNF with } \leq c \text{ conflicts is satisfiable}\}$. We want to determine the growth of c_k.

This paper is meant as an informal follow-up to [1], however, we try to keep this paper self-contained. The best known bounds for the parameter c_k are from [1]

$$\Omega(2.32^k) \leq c_k \leq O\left(\frac{4^k \log 3k}{k}\right) .$$

---

[*] Research is supported by the SNF Grant 200021-118001/1

1.1 Results

Our central technical tool is the famous Lovász Local Lemma (actually a more general version of it, called the *Lopsided* Lovász Local Lemma), see e.g. [2]. Usually stated in more abstract terms, we present a version that is already "compiled" into terms of CNF formulas.

Lemma 1 ([1]). *Let F be a CNF formula not containing the empty clause. Let π be a probability distribution under which all variables are independent. If for every $C \in F$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{D \in \Gamma_F(C)} \Pr_{\pi}[\neg D] \leq \frac{1}{4} \ , \tag{1}$$

then F is satisfiable. Here $\Pr_{\pi}[\neg D]$ denotes the probability of D being unsatisfied under a random assignment sampled according to distribution π.

For a literal u, let $\mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ denote the number of clauses of F containing u, and $\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$ the number of those containing $\bar{u}$. The following result follows immediately from Lemma 1, by taking π to be the uniform distribution.

Corollary 2 (basically given in [3]). *If F is a k-CNF and $|\Gamma_F(C)| \leq 2^{k-2}$ for every clause C, then F is satisfiable. Thus, $c_k \geq 2^{k-2}$.*

Corollary 3. *If F is a k-CNF, and $\mathrm{occ}_F(u) \leq \frac{2^k}{4k}$ for every literal u, then F is satisfiable.*

Proof. Note that $|\Gamma_F(C)| \leq \sum_{u \in C} \mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u}) \leq k\frac{2^k}{4k}$. By Corollary 2, F is satisfiable. □

Observation. $c(F) \geq \mathrm{occ}_F(u) \cdot \mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$ for every u.

In every unsatisfiable k-CNF formula with only "a few" conflicts there is a literal u which occurs "often" (by Corollary 3), and its negation occurs only "a few" times (by the above observation). It is natural to define the probabilities in such a way that it is more probable to set u to true. If we do this right, we will be able to prove

Theorem 4. *Every k-CNF formula F with less than $\frac{2^{(2-\alpha_k)k}}{128k}$ conflicts is satisfiable, where α_k is the smallest integer ℓ such that $f_k^{\ell}(x) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $x \in [0,1]$, and $f_k(x) = x\sqrt[k]{1-x}$.*

It is easy to see that this number α_k exists for every k. Furthermore, we can prove

Theorem 5.

$$\frac{\alpha_k}{k} \to -\int_{\frac{1}{2}} 1 \frac{1}{x\ln(1-x)} dx < 0.572$$

Corollary 6.

$$c_k \geq \Omega(2^{(2-0.572)k}) \geq \Omega(2.69^k) \, .$$

2 A Qualitative Idea of Our Approach

In this section we give a very informal outline of our approach. We do not want to bother the reader with calculations in this section, hence we use terms like "few", "many", "small" etc. in a deliberately vague way.

Imagine somebody gives you a k-CNF formula F with "few" conflicts, say 2.2^k, just to give some concrete number, and you want to prove that F is satisfiable. As a first step, you might check whether there is a literal u occurring in $\geq \frac{2^k}{4k}$ clauses. If not, F is satisfiable by Corollary 3, and we are done. If yes, consider some literal u with $\mathrm{occ}_F(u) \geq \frac{2^k}{4k}$. Recall the previous observation: $c(F) \geq \mathrm{occ}_F(u) \cdot \mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$. In other words, $\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$ is small, in our case $\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u}) \leq \frac{4k \cdot 2.2^k}{2^k} = 4k \cdot 1.1^k$.

Recall that in Lemma 1, we may choose any probability distribution, as long as all variables are set independently. So if $\mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ is large and $\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$ is small, why not set u to true with probability $> \frac{1}{2}$? This sounds reasonable, because $\mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ many clauses "benefit" from this, while only $\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{u})$ many clauses "suffer". For example, for a clause D containing u we now have $\Pr_\pi[\neg D] < 2^{-k}$. One might hope that using this non-uniform distribution, we can show that

$$\sum_{D \in \Gamma_F(C)} \Pr_\pi[\neg D] \leq \frac{1}{4} \, , \tag{2}$$

and thus, by Lemma 1, concluce that F is satisfiable. If one does the math, it turns out that in fact a k-CNF formula F is satisfiable if it has less than $O\left(\frac{k^2 2^k}{\ln k}\right)$ conflicts. We conclue that $c_k \geq \Omega\left(\frac{k^2 2^k}{\ln k}\right)$. This is, however, hardly better than the trivial lower bound of $c_k \geq \Omega\left(2^k\right)$. We would like to prove a bound of $\Omega\left(\gamma^k\right)$ for some $\gamma > 2$.

To achieve this, we have to apply a trick. Instead of estimating the sum in (2) for F, we estimate it for a new formula F'. We obtain F' from F by deleting certain literals from certain clauses. Roughly speaking, if $u \in D$, D has only few conflicts, $\Pr_\pi[\neg D]$ is not small enough and $\mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ is too large, we replace D by $D \setminus \{u\}$. If we do it right, (2) will hold for the resulting formula F'. Thus, by Lemma 1, F' is satisfiable, so F is, as well.

Let us become a little bit philosophical and ask why deleting certain literals helps. Clearly, the resulting formula F' is harder to satisfy than F, meaning that is has fewer satisfying assingments. However, by removing certain literals from certain clauses, we are "thinning out" the conflict structure of F, to a point where we can apply the Lovász Local Lemma. So to speak, there is less gold buried in F' than in F, but in F' it is closer to the surface.

3 Proof of Theorem 4

Let F be a k-CNF and let $c(F)$ be the number of conflicts of F. Throughout the proof, we will use the convention that x denotes a variable occurring in F, i.e., a positive literal, whereas u denotes a positive or negative literal. Further, we can assume w. l. o. g. that $\mathrm{occ}_F(x) \geq \mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{x})$, for every variable x, and that no variable is *pure*, i.e., whenever x occurs in F, then also $\bar{x}$ occurs in some clause. We define $p(x) = \Pr[x = 1]$ by

$$p(x) := \max\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(x)}{16c(F)}\right)$$

Also, we set $p(\bar{x}) = 1 - p(x)$. Indeed, this is a probability distribution because $c(F) \geq \mathrm{occ}_F(x)$ for every variable x. We choose the truth value of each variable independently according to $p(x)$. It holds that

$$p(u) < \frac{1}{2} \iff u = \bar{x} \text{ and } p(x) = \sqrt[k]{\frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(x)}{16c(F)}} > \frac{1}{2},$$

$$p(u) = \frac{1}{2} \iff \sqrt[k]{\frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(x)}{16c(F)}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \sqrt[k]{\frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(\bar{x})}{16c(F)}} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

We distinguish two types of clauses: *bad* clauses, which contain at least one literal u with $p(u) < \frac{1}{2}$, and *good* clauses, which only contain literals u with $p(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We subject every good clause of F to the following deletion process:

```
Algorithm: Deletion Process
Let $\mathcal{G} = \{D \in F : p(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \forall u \in D\}$
foreach $D \in \mathcal{G}$ do
    $j = k$
    $D = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k\}$ with $\mathrm{occ}_F(u_1) \leq \ldots \leq \mathrm{occ}_F(u_k)$
    while $\Pr[\neg D] > \frac{1}{8k\,\mathrm{occ}_F(u_j)}$ and $D \neq \Box$ do
        $D = D \setminus \{u_j\}$
        $j = j - 1$
    end
end
```

Note that the probabilities are not changed during the algorithm and also the occurences $\mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ remains unchanged, i.e., according to the original formula F.

Denote by F' the resulting formula of the deletion process. We have either $\Box \in F'$, i.e., some clause has lost all its literals in the deletion process, or $\Pr[\neg D] \leq (8k \max_{u \in D} \mathrm{occ}_F(u))^{-1}$ for every good clause in F'. The proof now proceeds in two steps. First, we show that if $\Box \notin F'$, then F' (and thus F) is satisfiable. Secondly, we finish the proof by showing that no clause has been completely deleted, i.e., $\Box \notin F'$.

Lemma 7. *Let F' be the result of the deletion process described above. If $\Box \notin F'$, then F' and F are satisfiable.*

Proof. We apply the Lovász Local Lemma with the probability distribution described above. For each clause $C \in F'$, we partition the neighborhood $\mathit{\Gamma}_{F'}(C)$ into $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, the set of bad and good clauses, respectively. Our goal is to show that

$$\sum_{D \in \mathit{\Gamma}_{F'}(C)} \Pr[\neg D] \leq \frac{1}{4}$$

for each $C \in F'$. Then it follows from Lemma 1 that F' is satisfiable. First, we estimate $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{B}} \Pr[\neg D]$. Since bad clauses are not subject to the deletion process, each bad clause still has k literals. A clause $D \in \mathcal{B}$ contains at least one literal that is satisfied with probability $< \frac{1}{2}$, which must be a negative literal. Let $\bar{x}_D$ be the literal in D with the smallest probability of being satisfied. Then,

$$\Pr[\neg D] \leq p(x_D)^k = \frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(x_D)}{16c(F)}$$

by the definition of the probability distribution. Furthermore

$$c(F) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{D \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathit{\Gamma}_F(D)| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{D \in \mathcal{B}} \mathrm{occ}_F(x_D)$$

where we put the $\frac{1}{2}$ because some conflicts might have been counted twice. Together this yields

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{B}} \Pr[\neg D] \leq \sum_{D \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(x_D)}{16c(F)} \leq \frac{1}{8} \ .$$

In a second step, we will bound $\sum_{D \in \mathcal{G}} \Pr[\neg D]$, i.e., the sum over all good neighbors of C. First note that for each $D \in \mathcal{G}$, there is at least one "responsible" literal u with $u \in D$, $\bar{u} \in C$. This literal can be responsible for at most $\mathrm{occ}_{F'}(u) \leq \max_{u \in D} \mathrm{occ}_F(u)$ clauses $D \in \mathcal{G}$. Also recall that $\Pr[\neg D] \leq (8k \max_{u \in D} \mathrm{occ}_F(u))^{-1}$. We calculate

$$\sum_{D \in \mathcal{G}} \Pr[\neg D] \leq \sum_{\bar{u} \in C} \sum_{\substack{D \in \mathcal{G} \\ u \in D}} \frac{1}{8k \max_{u \in D} \mathrm{occ}_F(u)} \leq \sum_{\bar{u} \in C} \sum_{\substack{D \in \mathcal{G} \\ u \in D}} \frac{1}{8k\mathrm{occ}_{F'}(u)} \leq \frac{1}{8} \ .$$

We conclude that $\sum_{D \in \mathit{\Gamma}_{F'}(C)} \Pr[\neg D] \leq \frac{1}{4}$, and therefore, by Lemma 1, F' is satisfiable. Thus F is satisfiable, which proves the lemma. □

Lemma 8. *If* $c(F) < \frac{2^{(2-\alpha_k)k}}{128k}$ *then the deletion process described above does not create an empty clause.*

Proof. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that it does create an empty clause. Let $C = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k\}$ be a good clause of F that becomes the empty clause during the deletion process. Order the u_i such that $\mathrm{occ}_F(u_1) \leq \cdots \leq \mathrm{occ}_F(u_k)$. Since the deletion process deletes all literals u_i from C, the inequality

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1 - p(u_i)) \geq \frac{1}{8k\mathrm{occ}_F(u_\ell)} \tag{3}$$

holds for every $1 \leq \ell \leq k$. Write $p_i := p(u_i)$ and note that $p_i \geq \sqrt[k]{\frac{\mathrm{occ}_F(u_i)}{16c(F)}}$ (either $u_i = x$, or $u_i = \bar{x}$ and $p(x) = p(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{2}$). Inequality (3) now becomes

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell}(1 - p_i) \geq \frac{1}{128kp_\ell^k c(F)} \tag{4}$$

Note that C does not contain bad literals, thus every literal is set to true with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ and therefore all $p_i \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. We will argue that such numbers $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ cannot exist for the our values of $c(F)$.

Claim. If there are values $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ satisfying inequalities (4) for all $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, then there are values $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ such that for each ℓ

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell}(1 - q_i) \geq \frac{1}{128kq_\ell^k c(F)} \ ,$$

and for all $q_\ell > \frac{1}{2}$, this inequality is satisfied with equality.

Proof. Just start with q_1 and try to make it as small as possible, but not smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$. Note that q_1 being small makes it only easier to satisfy inequalities $2, \ldots, k$. Then do the same with p_2, p_3 and so on. Formally, for $\ell = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, define

$$q_\ell = \min\left\{ q \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \ \middle|\ (1-q)\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1}(1 - q_i) \geq \frac{1}{128kq^k c(F)} \right\} \ .$$

By induction, $q_i \leq p_i$ for all $i < \ell$, and the set above is non-empty, because it contains p_ℓ, and it is closed. Therefore, q_ℓ is well-defined, and $q_\ell \leq p_\ell$. Clearly, if $q_\ell > \frac{1}{2}$, then the ℓ^{th} inequality is satisfied with equality. ☐

Let $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ be as in the claim. If all q_i's are equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ then the k^{th} inequality reads as $\frac{1}{2^k} \geq \frac{1}{128k2^{-k}c(F)}$, and thus $c(F) \geq \frac{1}{128k}4^k$, which contradicts our assumption. Therefore we can assume that the minimum $\ell = \min\{i \mid q_i > \frac{1}{2}\}$ exists. We obtain for $\ell \leq t < k$ that

$$\frac{1}{128kq_{t+1}^k c(F)} = (1 - q_{t+1})\prod_{i=1}^{t}(1 - q_i) = \frac{1 - q_{t+1}}{128kq_t^k c(F)} \ ,$$

and solving for q_t, we obtain $q_t = f_k(q_{t+1})$ for $f_k(x) := x\sqrt[k]{1-x}$. Consequently, we obtain $f_k^{k-\ell}(q_k) = q_\ell > \frac{1}{2}$ (note here that this is also for $\ell = k$ true). By definition of α_k, this means that $k - \ell \leq \alpha_k - 1$. Now focus on the $\ell - 1^{\text{st}}$ inequality:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1}(1 - q_i) \geq \frac{1}{128kq_{\ell-1}^k c(F)}$$

Using the fact that $q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_{\ell-1} = \frac{1}{2}$, by the definition of ℓ, and that $k - \ell \leq \alpha_k - 1$, we obtain

$$2^{-k+\alpha_k} \geq 2^{-\ell+1} \geq \frac{2^k}{128kc(F)} \ .$$

Re-arranging terms, we obtain $c(F) \geq \frac{2^{2k\alpha_k}}{128k}$, clearly a contradiction to our assumption. Therefore the deletion process cannot produce an empty clause. $\square$

Lemma 7 and 8 together imply Theorem 4.

4 Proof of Theorem 5

As promised, we want to estimate the values of α_k, or rather, compute $\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\alpha_k}{k}$ (and of course show that the limit exists). Recall the definition $\alpha_k = \min\{\ell \mid f_k^\ell(t) \leq \frac{1}{2}\ \forall t \in [0,1]\}$, where $f_k(t) = t\sqrt[k]{1-t}$. Since f_k has a unique maximum on $[0,1]$ which is attained at $t^* := \frac{k}{k+1}$, and is monotonically increasing for all $t < t^*$ and satisfies $f_k(t) \leq t$ for all $t \in [0,1]$, we get $f_k^\ell(t) \leq f_k^\ell(t^*)$ for all $t \in [0,1]$. We generalize the definition of α_k by defining $S_k(t_1, t_2) := \min\{\ell \mid f_k^\ell(t_1) \leq t_2\}$. Obviously, $\alpha_k = S_k(t^*, \frac{1}{2})$. Note that $S_k(t_1, t_2)$ is finite for $t_2 > 0$, and $S_k(t, t) = 0$.

Observation: For $0 < t_2 < t_1 \leq 1$, we have

$$S_k(t_1, t_2) - 1 \leq S_k(t^*, t_2) - S_k(t^*, t_1) \leq S_k(t_1, t_2)\ . \tag{5}$$

This follows from basic observations about iterated application of a function f_k with $f_k(x) < x$. If you will, you can view S_k as a metric on $(0, 1]$. The second inequality is thus simply the triangle inequality, and the first inequality states that triangles in this metric are "very flat".

Lemma 9. *Let $S_k(t_1, t_2)$ be defined as above, and $s_k(t) := \frac{1}{k} S_k(t^*, t)$. Then $s_k(t)$ converges for every $t \in (0, 1]$ to*

$$s(t) := \lim_{k\to\infty} s_k(t) = -\int_t^1 \frac{1}{x\ln(1-x)} dx$$

Proposition 10. *For $0 < t_2 < t_1 \leq 1$*

$$k\frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_1)} \leq S_k(t_1, t_2) \leq k\frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_2)} + 1 \tag{6}$$

Proof. We first prove the first inequality. Note that $t_2 \geq f_k^{S_k(t_1,t_2)}(t_1)$. We compute for $i \geq 1$

$$f_k^i(t_1) = f_k^{i-1}(t_1)\sqrt[k]{1 - f_k^{i-1}(t_1)} \geq f_k^{i-1}(t_1)\sqrt[k]{1-t_1}$$

because $f_k^i(t_1) \leq t_1$. Iterating i times, we obtain $f_k^i(t_1) \geq t_1(1-t_1)^{\frac{i}{k}}$. Plugging this bound into $t_2 \geq f^{S_k(t_1,t_2)}(t_1)$ and solving for $S_k(t_1, t_2)$ proves the first inequality.

For the second inequality, note that $f_k^\ell(t_1) > t_2$ for all $\ell \leq S_k(t_1, t_2) - 1$. Therefore $f_k^\ell(t_1) = f^{\ell-1}(t_1)\sqrt[k]{1 - f_k^{\ell-1}(t_1)} \leq f_k^{\ell-1}(t_1)\sqrt[k]{1-t_2}$. By iterating this argument, we obtain $t_2 < f_k^{S_k(t_1,t_2)-1}(t_1) \leq t_1(1-t_2)^{\frac{S_k(t_1,t_2)-1}{k}}$. Solving for $S_k(t_1, t_2)$, we obtain the claimed upper bound. $\square$

Combining (5) and (6) we obtain

$$\frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_1)} - \frac{1}{k} \leq s_k(t_2) - s_k(t_1) \leq \frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_2)} + \frac{1}{k} \ . \tag{7}$$

Note that althouhg we derived these inequalities for $0 < t_2 < t_1 \leq 1$, it is easy to see that they also hold for $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 \leq 1$. The idea of the proof is the following: We compute the derivative of s_k (never mind for the moment that s_k is not even continuous) by computing $\frac{s_k(t_2)-s_k(t_1)}{t_1-t_2}$ for $t_2 \to t_1$. Imagine that $k = \infty$, then the upper and lower bound of (7), devided by $t_1 - t_2$, converge to the same function $g(t)$. We can now compute $s_k(t)$ by integrating $g(t)$. The problem of course is that $s_k(t)$ is a step function, thus not continuous, and we do not know (yet) whether $\lim_{k\to\infty} s_k(t)$ exists. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 11. *Let $s_k(t)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}, t \in (0,1]$ be a sequence of functions with $s_k(1) = 0$ for all k. Assume that for all $0 < t_2 < t_1 \leq 1$, we have*

$$A(t_1,t_2) - \frac{1}{k} \leq s_k(t_2) - s_k(t_1) \leq B(t_1,t_2) + \frac{1}{k} \tag{8}$$

where $A, B : (0,1] \times (0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, $A(t,t) = B(t,t) = 0$ for all t, and $\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{A(t,t+h)}{h} = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{B(t,t+h)}{h} = g(t)$. Then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} s_k(t) =: s(t) = -\int_t^1 g(x)dx \ .$$

In particular, the sequence $s_k(t)$ converges to a continuous function.

Before we prove Lemma 11, let us show how to prove Lemma 9. We apply Lemma 11 with

$$A(t_1,t_2) = \frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_1)} \qquad B(t_1,t_2) = \frac{\ln t_2 - \ln t_1}{\ln(1-t_2)}$$

Note that these functions satisfy the requirements of Lemma 11. In particular,

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{A(t,t+h)}{h} = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{B(t,t+h)}{h} = \frac{1}{t\ln(1-t)} \ .$$

Now, Lemma 9 follows from Lemma 11.

Proof (of Lemma 11). First plug in $t_1 = 1$ into (8) to observe that $s_k(t_2)$ is bounded from below and above for all $0 < t_2 \leq 1$. Therefore, $\overline{s}(t) := \limsup s_k(t)$ exists, and similarly $\underline{s}(t) := \liminf s_k(t)$. Note that we do not even know at this point whether $s_k(t)$ converges, therefore we can only use limes superior and limes inferior.

Proposition 12. *: Let a_k, b_k be two sequences of real numbers which are bounded from above and below. If there are $L, U \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $L - \epsilon_k \leq a_k - b_k \leq U + \epsilon_k$, where $\epsilon_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, then*

$$L \leq \limsup a_k - \limsup b_k \leq U$$
$$L \leq \liminf a_k - \liminf b_k \leq U$$

Proof. First note that in general $\limsup a_k - \limsup b_k \neq \limsup(a_k - b_k)$. We will proof that $\limsup a_k - \limsup b_k \leq U + \epsilon$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. This will prove one claimed inequality. The other three inequalities can be proven similarly. So let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. For all sufficiently large k, $\epsilon_k \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By definition of lim sup, we have $a_k \geq \limsup a_k - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for infinitely many k. Hence we also have $b_k \geq a_k - U - \epsilon_k \geq \limsup a_k - \frac{\epsilon}{2} - U - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for infinitely many k. Therefore $\limsup b_k \geq \limsup a_k - U - \epsilon$, and the inequality follows. □

We apply Proposition 12 with $a_k = s_k(t+h)$, $b_k = s_k(t)$, $L = A(t, t+h)$, $U = B(t, t+h)$ and $\epsilon_k = \frac{1}{k}$:

$$\begin{aligned} A(t, t+h) &\leq \overline{s}(t+h) - \overline{s}(t) \leq B(t, t+h) \\ A(t, t+h) &\leq \underline{s}(t+h) - \underline{s}(t) \leq B(t, t+h) \end{aligned}$$

We divide both lines by h and let h go to 0. We obtain $\overline{s}'(t) = \underline{s}'(t) = g(t)$. Note that this implies as well that $\overline{s}(t)$ and $\underline{s}(t)$ are continuous. Since $\overline{s}(1) = \underline{s}(1) = 0$ by assumption on $s_k(t)$, we have

$$\overline{s}(t) = \underline{s}(t) = -\int_t^1 g(x)dx \ .$$

Hence the $s_k(t)$ converge to a continuous function $s(t)$, as k grows. This proves the lemma. □

References

1. Scheder, D., Zumstein, P.: How many conflicts does it need to be unsatisfiable? In: SAT. (2008) 246–256
2. Alon, N., Spencer, J.H.: The probabilistic method. Second edn. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York (2000) With an appendix on the life and work of Paul Erdős.
3. Kratochvíl, J., Savický, P., Tuza, Z.: One more occurrence of variables makes satisfiability jump from trivial to NP-complete. SIAM Journal of Computing **22**(1) (1993) 203–210